

REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present patent application are Claims 1 – 26.

Drawing Objections

Figures 3-5 are objected to for lacking a legend such as “Prior Art” because “only that which is old is illustrated.” Applicants traverse. Figures 3-5 illustrate embodiments in accordance with the present invention, for example, as recited in Claims 9, 19, and 26, *inter alia*. Applicants respectfully assert that Figures 3-5 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 113.

Claim Objections

Claims 21 and 22 are objected to because of the alleged informality of “referring to a previous step using ‘... after said step d).’ ” Applicants traverse. Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 21 and 22 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Craig (US# 6,654,785 B1, “Craig”) in view of Carini et al. (US 6,636,873, “Carini”). Applicants have carefully reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-20 are not rendered obvious by Craig in view of Carini.

Applicants respectfully assert that Craig and Carini are non-analogous art. Importantly, Craig and Carini employ versions of the term “synchronize” in vastly different manners. Applicants respectfully assert that Carini uses the term “synchronize” to describe a process in which information stored on one computer is made to correspond to data on another computer. For example, changes made to information on a first computer are reflected on a second computer by means of a synchronization or replication process. This usage of such terms is consistent with U.S. Pat. No. 6,000,000 to Hawkins et al., entitled "Extendible method and apparatus for synchronizing multiple files on two different computer systems", the disclosure of which is incorporated into Carini in its entirety by reference. This is also generally the usage of such terms within the present Application.

In contrast, Craig uses the term “synchronize” to mean to cause to occur at the same time: “The display is synchronized in that the same presentation URL is displayed at the instructor workstation and each of the plurality of student workstations.” (Abstract) Applicants respectfully assert that Craig does not teach, suggest or disclose data synchronization under the meaning of the term as used in the combined reference, Carini, or in the present Application.

To sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the multiple references must be analogous art. Applicants respectfully assert that Craig and Carini are non-analogous art, as the two inventions seek to accomplish very different end results. As the usage of the word “synchronization” is substantially different between the two references, one of ordinary skill in the art would not understand these references to be related at all. For this reason, Applicants respectfully

assert that Claims 1-26 overcome the rejections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

With respect to combining Craig in view of Carini, the rejection suggests that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be motivated to:

incorporate the various mobile devices, including web-enabled phones, i.e. wireless telephones, and PDA's, as taught by Carini into the invention of Craig, in order to allow potentially geographically disseminated and disconnected users to synchronize the data stored on their mobile devices.

Applicants traverse this suggested motivation. Applicants understand Craig to teach a "system for providing a synchronized display of information slides on a plurality of computer workstations" (Title). The term "slides" is generally understood to refer to full screen visual presentations. The use of the term "workstation" and the exemplary types of workstations illustrated in Craig are consistent with such an understanding. Applicants respectfully assert that there is no motivation in Craig or in Carini to attempt to display such "slides" on devices with limited visual display capability, e.g., "wireless telephones" and the like, as suggested by the rejection.

To sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), there must be a motivation in the prior art for the suggested combination. Applicants respectfully assert that there is no motivation in the prior art to combine Craig in view of Carini to realize any claimed subject matter as recited in the instant

claims. For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-26 overcome the rejections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

Further, Craig actually teaches away from the suggested combination. Craig teaches, “slides require no special formatting or processing” (column 8 lines 14-15) as would be necessary to display such slides on computers comprising vastly differing display capabilities, e.g., desktop computers and wireless phones.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-26 overcome the rejections of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

With respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that Craig in view of Carini does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of “client software comprising instructions for performing a synchronization compliant with said server” as recited by Claim 1. Rather, Craig teaches, “[t]he synchronization application includes a code segment to direct each of the student applets to retrieve and display the presentation slides located at the URLs designated by the instructor.” (Abstract) Further, Craig teaches, an:

important distinction between the ‘lecture server’ and a ‘slide server.’ The ‘lecture server’ is the system which supplies the Java applets and lecture configuration files, while the ‘slide server’ can be any system that can satisfy a URL reference made by a browser as directed by its applet. (column 9, lines 45-46)

Consequently, Craig teaches a system in which a first server ('lecture server') supplies client software for accessing information from a second server ('slide server'). In this manner, Craig actually teaches away from embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 1 that teach interaction with a single server.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Further with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that Craig in view of Carini does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of "using said client software to perform a synchronization with said server" as recited by Claim 1. As discussed previously, Craig does not use the term "synchronization" in the same sense as used in the present Application and in the Carini reference. For example, Craig is silent as to reflecting any data changes from client ("student") computers to "instructor" or "slide server" computers. As taught by Carini, a synchronization process involves two-way data replication. Consequently, Craig and Carini teach away from one another.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 1 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claims 2-10 depend from Claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that these Claims overcome the rejections of record as they depend from an allowable base claim, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

With respect to Claim 3, Applicants respectfully assert that Craig in view of Carini does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of “displaying said portion of said information on said display screen” as recited by Claim 3. Craig teaches, an:

important distinction between the ‘lecture server’ and a ‘slide server.’ The ‘lecture server’ is the system which supplies the Java applets and lecture configuration files, while the ‘slide server’ can be any system that can satisfy a URL reference made by a browser as directed by its applet.
(column 9, lines 45-46)

Applicants respectfully assert that Craig teaches that the “information” displayed on the “instructor” and “student” computers originates on a “slide server.” Applicants note that the “slide server” computer does not provide the client software as recited in Claim 3.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 3 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claim 8, Applicants respectfully assert that this Claim overcomes the rejections of record for the same rationale as presented with respect to Claims 3, above. Therefore, for this additional reason Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

With respect to Claims 11-20, Applicants respectfully assert that these Claims overcome the rejections of record for the same rationale as presented with respect to Claims 1-10, above. Therefore, for these reasons Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

With respect to Claim 21, Applicants respectfully assert that Craig in view of Carini does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of “client software comprising instructions for performing a synchronization compliant with said server” as recited by Claim 21. Rather, Craig teaches, “[t]he synchronization application includes a code segment to direct each of the student applets to retrieve and display the presentation slides located at the URLs designated by the instructor.” (Abstract) Further, Craig teaches an:

important distinction between the ‘lecture server’ and a ‘slide server.’ The ‘lecture server’ is the system which supplies the Java applets and lecture configuration files, while the ‘slide server’ can be any system that can satisfy a URL reference made by a browser as directed by its applet.
(column 9, lines 45-46)

Consequently, Craig teaches a system in which a first server (lecture server) supplies client software for accessing information from a second server (slide server). In this manner, Craig actually teaches away from embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 21 that teach interaction with a single server.

For this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 21 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Further with respect to Claim 21, Applicants respectfully assert that Craig in view of Carini does not teach, disclose or suggest the claim limitation of “using said client software to perform a synchronization with said server” as recited by Claim 21. As discussed previously, Craig does not use the term “synchronization” in the same sense as used in the present application and in the Carini reference. For example, Craig is silent as to reflecting any changes from client (“student”) computers to “instructor” or “slide server” computers. As taught by Carini, a synchronization process involves two-way data transfer or replication. Consequently, Craig and Carini teach away from one another.

For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 21 overcomes the rejection of record, and respectfully solicit allowance of this Claim.

Claims 22-26 depend from Claim 21. Applicants respectfully assert that these Claims overcome the rejections of record as they depend from an allowable base claim, and respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

CONCLUSION

Claims remaining in the present patent application are Claims 1 – 26.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Applicants have reviewed the following references that were cited but not relied upon and do not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: US 6,477,543 and US 6,295,541.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 10/27/2004



Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060